PERSONAL INTERVIEW

Applicants would like to thank the Primary Examiner Eugene Kim, for the time spent discussing the application, cited prior art, and final Office Action during a personal interview on March 3, 2004. Applicants have filed this Preliminary Amendment based on the discussions with Primary Examiner Kim.

SUMMARY

The present Preliminary Amendment is being filed with a Request for Continued Examination in response to a final rejection mailed on February 5, 2004. Claims 1, 3-7, 10-11, 25, and 30-33 will have been amended upon entry of this Preliminary Amendment and claims 1-7, 9-16, and 25-34 will be pending in the application.

REMARKS

In the final rejection mailed February 5, 2004, claims 1-3, 11-16, 25-29, and 34 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by *Stone* (U.S. 5,551,938). Claims 1, 3-5, 7, 9-11, 16, 25, 29-32, and 34 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by *Lang* (U.S. 5,147,480). Claims 4-7 and 30-33 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over *Stone* in view of *Stokes* (U.S. 1,800,288). Claims 1, 16, 25, and 34 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable by *Anderson* (U.S. 2,502,117). Applicant traverses these rejections, but has made the present claim amendments in the present Preliminary Amendment to expedite prosecution.

RESPONSE TO REJECTIONS UNDER 35 U.S.C. §§ 102 AND 103:

As discussed with Primary Examiner Kim on March 3, 2004, the rejections based upon *Stone* as applied in the final rejection should be removed as improper. Specifically, the Examiner

maintained the rejection with *Stone* as final and noted in the Response to Arguments that: "Stone teaches reinforcing substantially all of panel portion 58." However, as discussed with Primary Examiner Kim, *Stone*, and particularly panel portion 58, fails to disclose each and every element of independent claims 1 and 25, which each provide a ribbon of reinforcing material that is "adhered to substantially all of a selected panel portion of the web." In *Stone*, the ribbon 38 does not, and cannot, overlie and adhere to the panel portion 58 since, as seen in Figs. 1, 3, and 4, panel portion 58 is not adhered to ribbon 38. If panel portion 58 was adhered to ribbon 38, the box of *Stone* would not open. Since *Stone* does not disclose the reinforcing ribbon that overlies substantially all of, and adheres to, a selected panel portion, rejections based thereupon should be removed as improper. Additionally, the rejections based upon a combination of *Stone* and *Stokes* should be removed since *Stokes* fails to make up for the inadequacies of *Stone* by not disclosing a ribbon of reinforcing material that overlies and adheres to substantially all of a selected panel portion of the web.

As also discussed with Primary Examiner Kim on March 3, 2004, the rejections based upon the *Anderson* reference should also be removed as moot since *Anderson* discloses cutting only a laminating material. Since claims 1 and 25 disclose cutting the paperboard, which is not shown or taught by *Anderson*, the rejections based thereupon should be removed.

Claims 1, 3-5, 7, 9-11, 16, 25, 29-32, and 34 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by *Lang*. *Lang* discloses a method of applying a finishing layer in a corrugated line. Since corrugation inherently involves multiple layers of paperboard, at least one of which being corrugated, Applicant has amended the claims by the present Preliminary Amendment to only cover noncorrugated paperboard. Independent claims 1 and 25 as amended define over

Lang since *Lang* only is used with corrugated materials. *Lang* also fails to disclose a teaching or suggestion for using the process therein for noncorrugated paperboard.

Applicant has additionally submitted with this Preliminary Amendment, an updated Declaration Under 37 CFR § 1.132 by Steve McLary. The Declaration details that the reinforced paperboard described in the present application has achieved substantial commercial success, which is a factor that must be considered when addressing obviousness of an invention. Therefore, Applicant avers that the application is in line for allowance since each of the prior art references applied in the final rejection of February 5, 2004 has been overcome either by showing that the references do not apply to the claims as originally written, or by the present Preliminary Amendment. Applicant thus requests an early notice of allowance.

Respectfully Submitted,

3/15/04
Date

Keats A. Quinaly
Registration No. 46,426
Steven D. Kerr
Registration No. 32,472

Womble Carlyle Sandridge & Rice, PLLC
P.O. Box 7037
Atlanta, GA 30357-0037
(404) 879-2423 (Telephone)
(404) 879-2923 (Facsimile)

Docket No.: 7137/R029 1056